such things of one another? Is it that we are insecure and in constant need of propping ourselves up by denying that our neighbors have any foundations at all?

I may as well prove myself beyond help and deny Dr. Bales' assertion that "we have no inspired men today." I believe that the Spirit of God dwells in us and fills us. God still breathes upon men if they get close enough to Him! If this is not "inspiration", what shall we call it? The Spirit speaks through the written word, but not only through that word. I believe we need His guidance in understanding the relevance of that word for today and I am in no way dismayed when I realize that there is no precise piece of advice in the New Testament for every twentieth century problem. I believe in the promise of the indwelling Spirit and I believe that with His help I can come to know what Christ would have *me* do.

Granted, this is an area always delicate and always beset by uncertainties, so that a man must forever walk humbly and not insist that all are blind who do not see as he does. But somehow I have found that trustful walk a far happier experience than any I ever had in my old days of legalistic assurance. I used to be marvelously adept at hop-skotching my way safely across all abysses on the clearly marked squares of Perfect Doctrine. With the New Testament filtered through the *Gospel Advocate* and *Firm Foundation,* through Lipscomb and Hardeman, Wallace and Woods, I feared no foes and never had a moment's doubt that my way was right.

Now I have no hope of being right enough to merit redemption. Like the writers of *Voices* I acknowledge the infallibility of all men and all groups, and cast myself upon the mercy of God. And as my faith grows that this is the proper course for me, I lose my old zest for debating. It seems to me that there is no argument which will stop an argument. The only thing that stops an argument is a demonstration. The one unanswerable answer to the legalistic mind is a free Christian. I am perfectly content to leave *Voices* and its writers before that bar of judgment.—*Friends University, Wichita, Kan.*

By March 1 we hope to issue the 1966 volume of *Restoration Review* in book form, under the title "Resources of Power." You should reserve your copy at once. The price will be moderate.

We also plan to issue volume 9 for 1967 in book form, under the title "Things That Matter Most," which will be our theme for the new year. These editions have to be limited and there will be no more, so place your order well in advance.

You can subscribe to this journal for one year for only a dollar; in clubs of 6 or more at 50 cents each. Back copies available at 15 cents each.

RESTORATION REVIEW, 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.

RESTORATION REVIEW

VOICES OF CONCERN

Thousands in the Churches of Christ are profoundly disturbed already by the aridity which authoritarianism produces. They are apathetic when their preachers speak to them only the time-honored platitudes and party cliches. The time is ripe for the beginning of a slow, massive turnover. I have no doubt that it is underway. I am glad to see it begin because I so deeply value my heritage in the Church of Christ.—*Robert Meyers*

We ought to be restless when people try to confine us within the traditions of men; but the restlessness of some in *Voices* is due to their refusal to be satisfied with the fences which the Lord has built. They do not wish to be confined by the Word of God. We need to try to create an atmosphere based on both the breadth and the narrowness of the Scriptures; and while we should be narrow in convictions, so as to stay within the narrow way, yet we should be broad in our compassion and love.
—*James D. Bales*

In This Issue:

A REVIEW OF "VOICES OF CONCERN"
by James D. Bales and Robert Meyers

THE MEANING OF REAL HAPPINESS
by the Editor

Volume 9, No. 1 **January, 1967**

Editorial...

LEROY GARRETT, Editor

THE NEW LOOK IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

It was my good pleasure to be present for part of the Campus Evangelism Seminar held at the Baker Hotel in Dallas between the holidays. It was sponsored by the Broadway Church of Christ in Lubbock, but was largely financed by the fees paid by those in attendance, which was upward of $30.00 for all sessions. More than 300 Church of Christ young people were present, representing both state universities and Christian colleges.

My most immediate impression was that I was beholding what we might call "the new face of the Church of Christ," a face that *Restoration Review* has endeavored in its own humble way to help shapen. It further confirmed what I have long suspected: *the old Church of Christ orthodoxy is dying and a new brotherhood is emerging.* Indeed, the Holy Spirit is at work among us, and the move is on for a freer, a more benevolent, and a more brotherly Church of Christ—yes, and a more *united* one too.

The "Old Guard" was conspicuously absent. The big evangelists and editors who serve as the watchdogs of the brotherhood slept through this one. The "keepers of orthodoxy" just weren't there, which is too bad, for they would have seen a preview of what the next generation is going to do to their ecclesiastical playhouse. Even the Dallas clergy of the Church of Christ, who along with the Nashville hierarchy represents the most traditional element among us, was not there. To be sure, Wesley Reagan, a Dallas minister, was on the program, but he is quite obviously of the new persuasion rather than the old traditionalism.

We were thus given a new look at the Church of Christ. The daring young princes among us have crossed their Rubicon, and there is no evidence that they plan to turn back. Their faces seem to be directed toward Antioch rather than Jerusalem. They are behaving more like Paul and less like Peter. And in this regard it

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.

may be predicted that some delegations from Jerusalem will be arriving soon to see what Antioch is up to.

It is not every day that you hear a Southern Baptist clergyman at a Church of Christ gathering, but this happened when Dr. William R. Bright of the Campus Crusade for Christ spoke on "Revolutionaries for Christ." And there was no Church of Christ debater there to take care of him when he got through!

And this happened in Dallas! At a Church of Christ meeting in Dallas! Anything can happen in my dear old hometown, and it usually does. Oh, yes, this is not new for Wynnewood Chapel, where we have no qualms about inviting Jews and Roman Catholics as well as Baptists, but it is certainly new when the main-liners do such things. I rejoice! Praise God! When we did this kind of thing at Wynnewood Chapel the last time or two, the "Old Guard" in Dallas accused us of "trying to embarrass the Churches of Christ in Dallas," and they proceeded to apply pressure on our invited guests not to appear on our program.

And here we are, only a year or so later, in the same city with a Southern Baptist (a false teacher?) on a Church of Christ program. I must admit that, in spite of all the optimism which is being generated in my life, this surprised me. But it delightfully surprised me, not so much that I'm eager for Baptists to get on our programs, but it symbolizes the beginning of the end of a stupid and irresponsible exclusivism.

Now I am fully aware that these young princes have not yet ventured as far as others of us, not even so far as to recognize that Baptist as a brother and as belonging to the same body of Christ as ourselves, being the immersed believer that he is, and to call him brother as I would do (along with Alexander Campbell, David Lipscomb, and James A. Harding), but they have certainly taken a different fork in the road, one much less travelled by our people.

My excitement does not stem only from the fact that a Baptist appeared on a Church of Christ program, which is surely something of a *first* for us, but mainly because of *the new look* that the seminar presented. It was the aura of the occasion, a distinct difference in atmosphere, that struck me as prophetic of the dawning of a freer and more enlightened brotherhood. As I said to a group of the students as they were returning to their campuses and to their congregations back home, who had expressed concern about what their elders and ministers back home would think of such a gathering: "You have to keep in mind that what you have experienced at this seminar represents a different religion than what you have known in the Church of Christ, for this is *spiritual* while the other is not."

Indeed, one of the speakers felt obligated to caution the students before they left for home, "lest there be some misunderstanding," that all who participated on the program believe that one must be baptized for the remission of sins before he is a member of the body of Christ. I wrote this brother afterward, agreeing with him that man enters into Christ through immersion, but fearful that his statement would be interpreted to mean that we of the Church of Christ are, after all, the only

Christians. I thought it interesting that he felt obligated to insert such a "security clause" into the seminar. It revealed that something different had been said and that a different atmosphere had been created.

What was really different was the attitude toward the nature of the gospel. It was made *personal* instead of *doctrinal.* (Oh, yes, the good brother also wrote into the "security clause" the statement that none of the speakers believe that doctrine is unimportant!) There was emphasis upon the grace of God, and there was much more talk about winning people to Christ than converting people to the Church of Christ. Students were urged to confront others with "the most wonderful experience that has come into my life" and with "what Jesus means to me," and not once did I hear anything said about "getting them into the right church" or "preaching the plan of salvation." All the way the emphasis was upon the Man rather than some plan, which I know would have been to the consternation of the editor of the *Firm Foundation* had he been there, giving the editorial attention that he has to that subject. But I'll assure you that it wasn't to the consternation of the editor of *Restoration Review.*

One speaker stressed the fact that we can *know* that we are saved, while another insisted that "we are not satisfied with the *status quo.*" One even talked about the students "being filled with the Spirit when you leave here" and poked fun at "the Sabbatical tone" used by ministers in the pulpit, which is so artificial alongside the simple language of personal testimony. Indeed, they spoke again and again of "testifying for the Lord" and "witnessing for Christ," which is new vocabulary for Church of Christ folk.

They not only talked about "witnessing" but practiced it as well. One afternoon they swarmed over Dallas giving their testimony, which came under the program marked "3:00-5:30 Witnessing". Some went to the airport, others to bus and rail terminals, others to people on the streets. A few made their way to beer joins, and kept going until they found one that did not throw them out! It appeared that in all this nobody said anything about the Church of Christ. They spoke of Christ and of the grace of God instead.

I appreciated the way the seminar called for "a dramatic change", to quote Jim Bevis, the director, and for "revolutionaries on the college campus". It was refreshing to hear a call for concern in reference to the many international students on our campuses, and for it to be recognized that these students are the most logical way to send the gospel to other countries. The students were urged "to make out a schedule and put Christ on it", and "to have sessions alone with Him". It was pointed out to them that it is the transformed life that wins people to Christ and that they must demonstrate in their own lives the love of God.

It was indeed a new look in the Church of Christ. It is not like us to provide a table for the American Bible Society and to issue their materials in our gatherings. For their study in this seminar the students were given a copy of a modern version of the New Testament scriptures, published by the American Bible Society. Neither is it like us to recommend the use of materials of the Moody Bible Institute. And it sounds strange still for Church of Christ folk to quote Bonhoeffer and to suggest the reading of Leon Morris' works. It was different to hear one of our brethren speak disparagingly of the idea of *"converting* our Baptist friends", as if we should be converting sinners instead. I was impressed also that for their devotionals during the seminar they published their own group of songs, going beyond what can usually be found in our hymnals, such as "The Grace that is Greater than All my Sins". This song especially impressed me, for Mrs. Boyd Armstrong, my neighbor and one of the essayists in *Voices of Concern,* who died of cancer recently, requested that that hymn be sung at her funeral at the First Christian Church. As I heard that touching hymn at her funeral—"Grace, grace, sweet grace, grace that is greater than all my sins"—I tearfully pondered the need that we all have for that kind of religion. I had the same thoughts when I heard these college students sing it.

I could hardly contain myself when Jim Wilburn of the Bible Chair at Midwestern University in Wichita Falls said, "I love the secular university", and went on to urge the students "to identify with the campus". He referred to something that had appeared in "one of our papers" and expressed hope that it did not get onto the university campus. He also talked about "identifying with modern man", and urged upon us "a close personal relationship to Jesus Christ as Lord and Master".

This is from the same Church of Christ that usually condemns all "secular" education and insists that our young people go to a Christian college lest they be contaminated at a state university. But "the new look" presented an entirely different picture, even urging that the Christian college student spend at least a year at a state university. While the seminar did not downgrade the Christian colleges, it was geared to show what the Christian witness can accomplish on a "secular" campus. (That term *secular* in this context bugs me, as if Abilene and Pepperdine are *spiritual* while Texas and Georgia Tech are *secular*). To say the least this seminar by no means implied that the Church of Christ youth attending state schools (100,000 in number) should hurry away to "our colleges" and get a "Christian education".

The seminar was one more instance of what is going on all over the Christian world: *an effort to get away from the confines of an ecclesiastical atmosphere and out into the ongoing world.* Some call this movement "holy worldliness" or "worldy Christianity". Many groups from various denominations are having retreats, seminars, camps, and breakfasts at such worldly strongholds as business offices, hotels and motels, and community rooms at banks. They often charge for attendance. I was recently invited to such a meeting at a swanky hotel in Houston at which Billy Graham was to speak. It was a prayer-study retreat of well-heeled laymen. It cost $50.00 to enroll, not to mention the other expenses.

The meetings are held away from any church, and no denominational name is ever mentioned, even if it be sponsored by a particular one. They are often inter-denominational. The advertising is streamlined (as was the

Dallas meeting) and fresh, dynamic terms are employed to describe them, even terms that are existential in import (the Dallas seminar used "Solution-Revolution"). They are out in the world to witness for Christ, so they try to be dynamic in their approach. This is of course good and wise. No one is out trying to get somebody to come to church. They are out talking about Christ.

These "worldly Christians" are not using this approach simply because they think this is a better appeal to those they seek to reach, but also because they have more freedom "away from church". The minister at the Dallas seminar that took a jab at "this *brother* and *sister* bit" would not have felt as free to talk this way in the pulpit of a Church of Christ. I will have to agree with him that a lot of this brothering and sistering we do is a bit puerile. At least we could occasionally say, "Mr. Jones, our brother".

Surely this seminar was a freer experience for all who attended because it was held at the Baker Hotel than at the Broadway Church of Christ in Lubbock. We can doubt that Broadway is quite ready to invite a Baptist to participate in a program at the home church, though it will of course soon come, as it should. And the elders may not yet be ready to invite Carl Ketcherside to speak at Lubbock as he was invited, so I understand, to speak at the Dallas seminar about his experiences in witnessing to college students, and presumably would have accepted had there not been a conflict.

All this is good and we rejoice. And we commend the Lubbock elders for their forward look. If we can have more latitude in committing our "heresy" by going to a hotel, then to hotels let us go. "Well, after all that was down at the Baker Hotel . . . " It may be a strange mentality that sees any difference here, when it is still sponsored by one of our leading churches, but if in this way we can "save face" and move on out into the world around us, then let's get with this hotel bit. After all, there is nothing new about committing sins in a hotel!

Our good brother, Mr. John Hay, an elder at Broadway, made a farewell statement to the students, and it was a good one. He said, "You are writing a page in church history". And I left there wondering if the dear brother realized just how true his statement may prove to be. May the pages they are writing grow into chapters and the chapters into volumes. Believing as I do that God is a history-making God and that His Spirit is at work among us, I am willing, as the poet says, "to labor and to wait".—*the Ed.*

Is it not a fact that we can tell an educated man from another chiefly by his capacity for resisting another man's thoughts and defending his own views?

—*A. E. Dimnet*

Things That Matter Most . . . No. 1

THE MEANING OF TRUE HAPPINESS

Only a few things have universal application, but the desire for happiness is presumably one of them. It seems safe to say that all men desire happiness, even when they differ broadly as to what it means to be happy. Perhaps the desire is natural, being as instinctive as self-preservation. Surely there are many more people who refer to happiness as their life's goal than have any real understanding of the nature of happiness. One would be hard put to go out into the world to find someone who does not want to be happy, but it would be equally difficult to find someone who has a clear understanding as to what he means by the term. It is shrouded with vagueness.

In reply to my question as to what happiness is, one person said that it is having everything one desires, which is more definitive than most answers you will get. Having everything that one desires! We would suppose that if *that* would not make a man happy, then he just cannot be made happy. And yet there have been many miserable people that have had everything they desired. So there may be an important relationship between *what* one desires and his being happy. Thus in the title of this essay we imply a distinction between true and false happiness. Many there are who think they are happy who are not *really* happy. This is true of many things: people think themselves well when they are diseased or as educated when they are ignorant.

What Is Happiness?

The common view is that happiness is a kind of pleasant feeling about life's experiences, whether love, work or play. It is the composite of many pleasures, including good health, prosperity, and a life absent of tragedy. Webster defines it as "a state of well-being and pleasurable satisfaction; bliss".

These ideas of happiness raise questions about what *pleasure* means. Jesus is referred to in prophecy as "a Man of sorrows", and His life would hardly be viewed as a life of pleasure, and yet we think of His life as the very essence of happiness, in spite of all the suffering He endured and the tragedy He experienced. Prison or the rack can hardly be thought of as pleasant, but might a man who is subjected to such pain be happy nonetheless. So if we define happiness in terms of pleasure we have to keep *kinds* of pleasure in mind.

Sigmund Freud put his psychoanalytic mind to the task of explaining happiness, and he concluded that the opposite of happiness is not tragedy but neurosis. Happiness is therefore peace of mind. He sees the happy person as one who masters his inner conflicts and is well-adjusted to his environment. This view will allow for pain and tragedy, but shows that happiness involves a *quality* of soul that knows how to cope with hardship.

If the Greeks had a word for everything else, we can be sure that they had one for happiness. In fact they had several, for happiness was considered the *summum bonum* of life, and the great philosophers dedicated their lives to the study of what makes life good. Plato defines happiness as

spiritual well-being, as harmony in the soul, and as inner peace. The happy man is the *just* man, Plato points out, and justice refers to the well-ordered life. To live justly is to live harmoniously, with one's mind, body and soul in proper balance, and this is happiness.

Aristotle sees happiness as the only intrinsic good. Whether you name love, duty, courage, honesty, beauty or whatever, he would say things are all *unto* happiness. His word for it would best be translated *self-realization.* As a man fulfills his potential, something like an acorn becomes an oak, he is happy. It is the virtuous man that is happy, in other words, and by *virtue* Aristotle means *proper function.* A knife has virtue if it cuts; a tree has virtue if it bears fruit. So a man is virtuous if he is reasonable and otherwise behaves as a man is suppose to, according to his nature.

It was out of the context of this kind of thinking that gave us the word we translate *sin.* To the Greeks it meant "missing the mark", such as the archer does when his arrow misses the target. It is thus the mis-directed life that is sinful, a life that does not move toward fulfillment. The Christian sees sin as that which moves a man off the course set for him by the will of God. We may be, therefore, close to the meaning of happiness when we associate it with the fulfillment of our potential according to God's will. Happiness (hitting the mark) and sin (missing the mark) may come close to being opposites.

While Aristotle insists that man needs at least a minimum of material wealth to be happy, the Greeks generally stress the *internal* aspects of man as that which makes for happiness. They thus prepared the soil for the Christian teaching on the subject. Socrates was the first to talk about "nurturing the soul" in order to be happy. He spoke of death as an experience to be desired, for then one could be with God and enjoy an even greater happiness. Plato writes that "a pattern is laid up in heaven" for the good life, and for this reason the pleasures of the mind are much more important than those of the flesh. The man, therefore, who injures others for personal gain is miserable, while he who chooses to suffer wrong rather than commit wrong is happy. Thus the Greeks see the happy man as virtuous, disciplined, reasonable, and one who is motivated by high ideals.

Building on these Greek concepts, John Stuart Mill expresses his happiness theory in terms of "the greatest happiness for the greatest number", and he believes this is motivated by "a sense of humanity" within us all. We all want to be happy ourselves, and we have the noble impulse to make others happy. So the good life consists in creating as much happiness as possible for as many people as possible, including one's self. And Mill is distinctly Christian in his thinking when he observes that a man should choose to sacrifice his own well-being in order to bring an abundance of happiness to many others. This is what Jesus did, and it is the responsibility of all Christians. Mill's point is that pleasure or happiness *is* the justifiable goal for man; it is that for which all humanity should be striving. A Christian should seek to generate as much happiness in this world as possible, and eventually even greater

bliss in heaven, both for himself and for others. But in any situation in which his own happiness conflicts with the happiness of many, he must yield to "the greatest happiness for the greatest number". Thus we find Paul saying of his Jewish brethren: "I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart, for I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen by race." (Rom. 9:2-3

There is a blessed contradiction in all this, for as one forfeits his own well-being for the good of others he discovers the highest happiness. "He who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake will find it." (Matt. 10:39) Is not Jesus saying that if one is willing to be "unhappy" so that others might be happy that that man finds an even higher happiness? We put "unhappy" in quotation marks, for he is not really unhappy in doing what he believes God wants him to do, though he may suffer pain and hardship.

This gets at the nature of true happiness. Jesus was truly happy even on the cross, for He had that peace of mind that can come only through a will that is completely surrendered to God. Even amidst severe pain and privation one may enjoy pleasures of soul. Ordinarily we do not think of a man being happy when rocks are being thrown at him, and yet it is possible that Stephen's happiest experience on earth was when he "gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7:55), despite the stones.

We must conclude, therefore, that true happiness is related to one's personal communion with God. One may be "happy" in a materialistic sense in that "he has everything he wants", and yet not be in communion with God. But we have to say that such a one does not want the things he ought to want. He is ignorant of the things that matter most. If he would look deep inside himself he would discover unfulfilled desires that only a turning to God can satisfy. The happy life is the transformed life, one made into the likeness of Christ by the grace of God. Happiness is the quiet joy of a surrendered life. It is the satisfaction that all is well between God and self.

Ingredients of Happiness

What is the essence of happiness—the one ingredient without which one cannot be happy? Hardly any term will serve to answer this as does *selflessness.* One of the most striking descriptions of our Lord tells us that "Christ did not please himself . . . " (Heb. 13:3) In this context we have the prescription for happiness: "Let us each please his neighbor for his good, to edify him, and not to please ourselves."

The Christian is to see selflessness as more than the nobel effort of putting God first, others second, and ourselves last. We can run right smack into a mess of pride with this kind of thinking. To the measure that we become truly selfless we do not count at all, whether first, second or last. We will not even think in those terms. The self becomes unmindful of where it stands, first or last, for a consciousness of any position of self savors of pride. Our Lord did not merely put others before Himself, for He did not consider Himself at all.

"For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sake he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich." (2 Cor. 8:9)

"Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a think to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross." (Phil. 2:5-8)

He was rich, but chose to become poor! Though in heavenly glory, He emptied Himself! Is this not the way of real happiness? And so Paul urges: "Do nothing from selfishness or conceit, but in humility count others better than yourselves." (Phil. 2:3)

Notice that language: *count others better than yourself!* He is really saying, *Forget self!* or perhaps, *Lose yourself in service to others!* We cannot achieve such a standard on our own. It is not a matter of self-discipline. It calls for a transformation of life, a new birth. It demands the death of the old self within us. It is the kind of selflessness Paul speaks of in Gal. 2:20: "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

"For you have died, and your life is hid with Christ in God." (Col. 3:3) This is the selflessness that makes for real happiness. It is a happiness that is not directly sought. It is Christ that we seek. His we are and Him we serve, as Paul puts it. We are not trying to achieve happiness. Rather we hide our lives in God by forgetting self. The happiest people are those who are not particularly aware of happiness itself. They simply do not give themselves enough thought to consider whether they are happy.

Happiness is like humility in this regard. Humility is not something you work hard to achieve. The humble person would never say, "Well, I've had a pretty good day today in being humble. Maybe I can be even more humble tomorrow." Nor would he be like the Trappist monk that described his Order's strongest point by commenting: "We are known for our humility." A conscious humility is pride. In the same way the happiest people are not those with a "Be Happy Today" program going. They are busy serving, too busy to be concerned even about their own happiness. They are, of course, happy, the happiest of all people, but it was not attained through conscious effort. Again the Lord's assuring promise: "He who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake will find it."

Everyone has his own idea about what makes people happy. Some say money, others say friends. Some emphasize health, others education. Surely all such values are ingredients in varying degrees for the good life. But it is Cicero's statement that intrigues me: "It is character, not circumstance, that makes one happy." Maybe that is an overstatement, for it does seem that a modicum of favorable circumstance is necessary to happiness. It is understandable that a man is not happy when unemployed, sick, or hungry —or dying on a field of battle. Yet as a Christian he can be happy, even in travail. We have to concede, however, that it is a rare exception when a man is happy in dire circumstance. But Cicero's statement is pointing to the right ingredients when he says *character* is what makes people happy. And he is very Christian in this emphasis, for this is precisely Jesus' point in the beatitudes He gave. That is what *blessed* means; it means *happy.* In giving them Jesus was instructing regarding character.

"Happy are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." This blessing of Jesus has in it a whole attitude toward life. It searches a man's character. It is saying that the way to power is through realizing one's helplessness, and the way to victory is through the admission of defeat. It also shows that wealth does not consist in the possession of things. It is saying that happiness in this world and in eternity comes through a humble acceptance of God's will in one's life.

"Happy are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." The story is told of a great musician who was listening to a talented young singer, who had a beautiful voice but had just missed greatness. "She will be great," said the old master, "when something happens to break her heart." Robert Frost was saying something similar when he observed that the heart of a poet must break before he writes great poetry. As paradoxical as it appears, our Lord is relating sorrow to bliss, that there can be no true bliss without mourning. The old Arab proverb says it this way: "All sunshine makes a desert." Perhaps our Lord is telling us that heavenly bliss comes to those who sorrow over the predicament of humanity with all its sin and suffering. It may be proper for a Christian to be detached from *things,* but never from *people.* He cannot have the passivity of a Stoic, but the kind of spirit that rejoices with those that rejoice and weeps with those that weep. It is the man who, like his Lord, is "moved with compassion" in the presence of a troubled world that will enjoy eternal bliss.

"Happy are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Meekness is a badly understood term in our culture, and very few would think of it as an ingredient for happiness. Nietzsche called it "a slave morality", insisting that meekness is nothing but weakness. But the poet Browning had deeper insight, for he could see strength and gentleness combined. It is good to have a giant's strength, he pointed out, but not good to use it like a giant. Jesus is referring to the God-controlled man as the happy man. Nietzsche's fallacy is that he saw power as an end in itself, not as a means to something greater. Jesus too speaks of power. He would say with Bacon that knowledge is power. So is money. So is fame and position. But the happy man, Jesus is saying, is the man who lets God so control his life that all his capacities for power are sublimated by love and service to others.

So with all the beatitudes. They relate character to happiness, just like old Cicero did. "Happy are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled," is referring to the bliss of the starving soul. The man who feels no real need before God will never be happy. He is too full of self.

Obstacles to Happiness

From our conclusions thus far we are obligated to point to *selfishness* as the most serious obstacle to a happy life. But there are, of course, other obstacles, some of which no doubt stand in the way even when selfishness does not. Ignorance for instance. Surely we are morally obligated to be informed and intelligent, and when we spurn such a duty the penalty is unhappiness in one form or another. Plato was not far wrong in equating knowledge with virtue. While ignorance is often excusable, it nonetheless takes its toll. Wilful ignorance is terribly wrong. That ignorance is bliss is one of the great lies of the ages. It is the same lie that teaches us not to be bothered with racial and social outcasts amidst all their poverty and ignorance since "they are happier than we are". How can an ignorant man be happy when it is so contrary to nature? God made him to think and to know and to solve problems and to be challenged by ideas. Keep him in ignorance so he will be happy? Ridiculous! God wants him to be educated, and the better educated he is the greater his capacity for happiness. While it is true that one might get the wrong kind of education, no one can ever become too well educated. We do, of course, have reference to the cultivation of the mind and soul rather than academic degrees or years in school.

A man's chances for happiness may also be hurt by ambition and jealousy. King Saul's jealousy of David enslaved him. Despair and neurosis was the reward, whereas he otherwise had such a great potential for happiness. Shakespeare's Macbeth was once tied in love and singleness of purpose to his wife; he was brave, noble, imaginative. Happiness was his to have, but he was ruined by reckless ambition, an ambition that did not stop even with murder. He illustrates how tragedy is the opposite of happiness. Surely having what one desires has something to do with being happy, but so much depends on *what* one desires and *how much* he desires it. Ambition can blind one and even pervert his imagination, as it did to Macbeth.

Buddhism makes a good point in identifying unhappiness as the universal problem of life, and in recognizing "selfish craving" as the cause of the misery in the world. The purpose of its "Eightfold Path" is to show man how to escape from unbridled desire. The eight steps are right understanding, right purpose, right speech, right conduct, right vocation, right effort, right alertness, right concentration.

A noble list of ingredients for happiness to be sure. The Christian would insist on no less, but he would urge that the Christ walk with us upon the path. Not only because it would be lonely without Him, but because there can be no happiness without Him.—*the Editor*

Thou shalt seek out every day the company of the saints, to be refreshed by their words.—*Didache* 4:2

"WHY DON'T YOU TEACH AT A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE"

DAVID R. REAGAN

Prof. Reagan asked me to explain to our readers that this article was first submitted to Editor Reuel Lemmons of the *Firm Foundation* for publication inasmuch as that journal was running articles about teaching in the Christian colleges. The *Firm Foundation* rejected the article. Prof. Reagan writes from Manila: "Ask the readers if they can figure out why." So in behalf of the free flow of ideas we pass the article along for your evaluation. You can write to the professor himself about your reaction.—*Editor*

As the old saying goes, "I wish I had a penny for everytime I've been asked that question!" I wish too that I had some photos of the puzzled facial expressions that I've received in response to my answer.

The question stems from a basic belief prevailing within our brotherhood that any teacher with a Master's Degree or above "owes it to the Lord" to sacrifice all academic opportunities in order to teach at a "Christian College." The quizzical reactions to my answer are due also to a fundamental belief of our brotherhood—the sincere conviction that we of the Church of Christ have an absolute monopoly on the truth. For you see, my answer is that "I am an educator and not a propagandist."

The thrust of my answer centers around the difference between education and indoctrination. As I see it, education—especially higher education—should be a thought provoking process dedicated to the search for truth. Note that I said the *search* for truth. In other words, education is not a process whereby one *receives* a corpus of doctrine which has been given the imprimatur of some omnipotent person. Higher education does not consist of the memorization and regurgitation of dogma. This is a mechanical process which has the capacity to produce nothing more than automatons who can recite the accepted answer when the proper button is pushed but who are totally incapable of the type of rational involvement which can cope with the unexpected and produce a degree of problem solving ability. In short, the only thing that an indoctrination-oriented educational process produces are walking encyclopedias who are out of date before they are graduated.

Truth must be sought, and this means that the truth seeker must constantly question accepted dogmas. The life of Alexander Campbell is a powerful testimony to the validity of this principle. Of course, such a critical attitude is impossible within an environment where people are convinced that they have arrived at the truth and must, therefore, dedicate themselves to its protection and preservation . . . and this is precisely the environment which unfortunately characterizes the campuses of our "Christian Colleges."

The evidence of this condition is overwhelming. For one thing, prospective faculty members are carefully screened to make certain that they are ironclad supporters of every tenet of the "mainstream" Church of Christ creed (and I'm not talking about the New Testament). Accordingly, anyone believing in musical instruments, one cup, or missionary societies or who is opposed to located ministers, orphan's homes or the Herald of Truth is absolutely taboo. Such tests of academic acceptability would be bad enough if they were confined to those applying

to teach in the Religion Department, but the really ridiculous thing is that they are applied equally to prospective Chemistry, Agriculture, and Music teachers — as well as everyone else! Even more disgusting is the way in which this doctrinal testing as a condition for employment has spread to include an applicant's political, economic and social beliefs. As a political science professor, I know first hand that our "Christian Colleges" are anxious to acquire social science teachers who are sympathetic to right wing political doctrines. After all, it is common knowledge that the vast majority of our brotherhood are advocates of States' Rights and unfettered free enterprise—in fact, advocates to the point of arguing that these are the only political and economic positions that are compatible with Christianity. Again, the truth has been discovered and it must be protected, and our "defender of the faith" colleges have rushed to fulfill this role. Allow me to relate one of many personal experiences which I have had along this line. About a year ago I was the "master of ceremonies" at a week long area wide meeting conducted by one of the leading evangelists in our brotherhood, a man who also happened to be a professor of Bible at one of our church related colleges. One day as we were eating lunch together, he began to "feel me out" on the Vietnam issue. When it became apparent that I was a supporter of United States policy in Asia, he suddenly sighed with relief and enthusiastically encouraged me to apply for an opening at his college. Little if any consideration was given to my academic preparation or my teaching ability. The crucial factor was our harmony of opinion on a political issue. I happen to know as a fact that his attitude reflected the thinking of the administration of his college. What is really funny about this whole incident is that I have shifted my position on the Vietnam question several times both before and after our conversation —but I guess that too is "unthinkable."

Another manifestation of our colleges' indoctrinational approach to education is their attitude toward special campus speakers. Every attempt is made to insulate the students from any unorthodox view. Lectureships are discreetly arranged to provide the audience with one particular viewpoint regarding any controversial issue. Chapel programs are glorified Sunday School sessions reserved for either patriotic speeches or creedal reaffirmations. To extend an invitation to a Baptist theologian to present a series of lectures would be considered heretical, despite the fact that he may have served as the primary graduate instructor of many of the professors in the Religion Department! One of our colleges recently got so carried away in its campaign for doctrinal purity on all fronts that the administration cancelled a talk by one of the country's most popular news broadcasters on the grounds that he was "too controversial." Please note: this man was a news *broadcaster,* not a commentator, and had probably never spoken a single controversial word in public in his entire life. But what if he had? That's right, let's suppose he was a very controversial person—so controversial in fact that his appearance would have elicited pickets. Would this have been justifiable grounds for

dismissal of his talk? Isn't this precisely the type of person that a student needs to hear? What makes this particular episode even sillier is that a few weeks later the same college administration was more than happy to endorse the idea of a student parade down the main street of town in support of United States policy in Vietnam. Now I ask you, what could possibly be more controversial than a student demonstration that blocks traffic? I know—a student demonstration in *opposition* to American policy! But that too would be "unthinkable."

Is it any wonder that our "Christian Colleges" are finding it next to impossible to attract and retain adequate faculty? Of course there are many other complicating factors such as heavy teaching loads, poor salaries, and low academic standards—to name only a few. But in my opinion the academic environment is the fundamental problem. A person who has completed years of reputable graduate work preparing himself for the stimulating role of an educator just simply is not attracted by the prospect of serving in the academically suffocating role of propagandist. Tragically—but predictably—those few hardy souls who have attempted to buck the system have either been clubbed into submission or drummed out of the ranks as "trouble makers."

I have a feeling that I have overstated my case, because I am convinced that the majority of our brotherhood would readily admit the validity of the charges that I have brought against our colleges. For again, most of our brethren are convinced that we have a monopoly on the truth—and if one is engulfed in this conviction, then it is only natural that he should desire a parochial educational system that will defend the faith to his children.

No, I do not blame the administrations of our colleges for the stifling atmosphere of indoctrination which pervades their campuses. *I blame the rank and file members of the Church.* Our colleges exist to serve them, and the policies of our higher educational institutions are simply a reflection of the childish attitudes of the parents of our college aged young people.

But there are winds of change blowing. There is a fire of unrest within our brotherhood that cannot be quenched, for its fuel is the vigor and dynamism of a youth siezed with the truth seeking spirit of Alexander Campbell. Yes, our young people are challenging and questioning as they have never done before; and the shibboleths of today will be the inevitable victim of this intellectual upheavel, just as a truer understanding of God's love and grace will be its product.

(The author received his Ph.D. degree from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a graduate school in international relations which is administered jointly by Tufts and Harvard Universities. He is an Assistant Professor of Government at Austin College, but is currently serving as a Fulbright Lecturer at the University of the Philippines in Manila. He may be addressed care of the American Embassy, U. S. Educational Foundation, Manila.)

Loyalty to the New Testament is doing for our time what they did for their time, not to do what they did. I am intolerant of those who demand conformity.—*Henry J. Cadbury*

"VOICES OF CONCERN" — INTRODUCTION

JAMES D. BALES

Capable men, for one reason or another, have left us. We should study what they have to say in order to learn any truth which they may have; and to better equip ourselves for the tasks of answering questioners and contending for the faith (I Pet. 3:15-16; Jude 3). This should be done, although it is obviously much easier to say than to do it, in the proper spirit (II Tim. 2:24-25; I Pet. 3:15-16).

Voices condemns some sins, errors, and shortcomings of brethren. It advocates some old denominational errors. It also contains modernism. We should profit by any deserved criticism, and endeavor to answer its errors.

The Tent of Faith

The Jacket of the book states that its purpose is to lengthen the ropes, and strengthen the stakes, of the tent of faith so that all God's children can dwell in it. Just where would the Episcopal priest drive down the stakes? His Church contains the atheist Dr. Thomas J. J. Altizer who asserts that God is dead, and Bishop Pike who opposes many Biblical doctrines. How can the tent of faith include Thomas P. Hardeman who has an aversion to traditional theism? (p. 99). *Voices* contains some conflicting voices of confusion and apostasy which destroy the tent and create a tower of Babel.

Unity in Diversity?

Dr. Meyers said: "The book obviously means to urge no one way of religious expression, but to plead from such evidence as is here the need for *unity in diversity.*"

"This kind of unity would have kept most of the people who left." (p. 5).

The Bible does teach a unity in spite of certain diversity. Christians are at different stages of growth and development. Those who are babes in Christ, and who feed on the milk of the word, have not grown so that they eat and assimilate the meat. There are those who have not grown; and thus, although by reason of time they ought to be teachers of the Word, they have need for someone to teach them anew. Romans 14 shows that there is a diversity which is due Christians being at different stages of knowledge of God's will. And thus, while having "one mind" as our ideal (I Cor. 1:10-12), yet we can fellowship other Christians without their having attained perfection. Obviously, none of us has attained perfection. And yet, the Bible also shows that there are limits to "unity in diversity". To accept the diversity which is found in *Voices* would mean that we must leave the Bible. Furthermore, Paul taught against the diversity in the unity in the Church in Corinth.

Dr. Meyers wrote: "Thousands are restless and dissatisfied with the aridity of exclusivism and authoritarianism. Bright young minds are refusing to be put off with answers that have no more to commend them than the hoary beard of antiquity." (p. 3).

Our spirit of exclusivism ought to be as broad and as narrow as the Bible (Matt. 7:13-14). The authoritarianism should be not that of the traditions of men, but of authority of Jesus Christ (John 12-48). Our answers should be reliable answers, and with credentials other than mere age. There are, it is true, those who have reacted

against unscriptural attitudes and unscriptural narrowness on the part of some. We ought to be restless when people try to confine us within the traditions of men; but the restlessness of some in *Voices* is due to their refusal to be satisfied with the fences which the Lord has built. They do not wish to be confined by the Word of God. We need to try to create an atmosphere based on both the breadth and the narrowness of the Scriptures; and while we should be narrow in convictions, so as to stay within the narrow way, yet we should be broad in our compassion and love. But to broaden our teaching so that it embraces such positions as those advocated by Thomas P. Hardeman, for example, is to abandon God's truth for man's futile speculations. The Church is not ours to broaden it or narrow it according to our ideas; instead the church has been created by God, and we need to study God's word to know its nature and its boundaries. We did not write the Bible, and we do not have the right or the power to change what it teaches. We do have the responsibility of studying, living, and sharing the Word of God.

Robert Meyers hopes that this book would help to create the feeling on the part of a father, whether a minister of the gospel or not, that "he may well be delighted if his child leaves the home church so long as her motive is a passionate desire to find *for herself* the highest and holiest way of worship..." (p. 4). As far as I can tell, he does not bring this to the test of the New Testament revelation. Perhaps Buddhism would seem higher and holier to some. Perhaps there are others who would enjoy the worship of Bacchus. If there is no standard of authority, who is to say that these are not higher and holier for those who like them?

The Lordship of Jesus

Dr. Meyers wrote that: "It is not only unimportant to us that we do not agree with each other in every detail; it is, rather, a matter for rejoicing that in these pages men who accept Jesus as Lord may speak their minds without restrictions. We consider the variety itself a significant part of the lesson this book would teach. Free minds cannot be predicted. The Spirit of God really does move at liberty like the invisible air, and it impels men in various ways." (p. 5)

First, to accept Jesus as Lord means that we must endeavor to be in submission to His will; both in things which seem small or which seem great (Matt. 7:21-23; Lk. 6:46). Second, how can Meyers think that Thomas P. Hardeman, for example, accepts Jesus as Lord? How can some of the writers accept Jesus as Lord, when they repudiate some things which are clearly taught in the Bible? Third, minds which free themselves from the authority of Christ and His word cannot be predicted. There is no telling what straw they will grasp, or what bubble they will try to catch, or what truth they will repudiate. Fourth, unless one accepts the Bible, he cannot know whether there is any "Spirit of God". And if one accepts the Bible, he is not free to view anything and everything as the movement of the Spirit of God.

How does Meyers know when and how the Spirit moves men? We cannot know anything about the mind of God; except as God has revealed it through His Holy Spirit through the

inspired men of the first century (I Cor. 2:10-16). No one of us can teach by inspiration, although we have the inspired Word to teach. Since we have no inspired men today, we must listen to what the Spirit says through the written Word. The Spirit can and does speak through the written word (Rev. 2:1, 7). Fifth, how would Dr. Meyers test teaching and action to know whether or not the person is moved by the Spirit? Without the authority of the Bible, how does he know what the Lordship of Jesus Christ means? Will he deny the inspiration of the Bible, while affirming the inspiration of some modernists?—*Harding College, Searcy, Ark.*

REPLY TO DR. BALES

ROBERT MEYERS

A man can raise more questions in a page than can be answered adequately in a book. I can only touch upon a few of the comments Dr. Bales makes in his first printed response to *Voices of Concern.*

I confess even so to a sense of futility. Dr. Bales and I occupy such widely different thought worlds, and speak from such divergent premises religiously, that it seems unlikely I can do much more than express my appreciation for his convictions and my admiration for his good qualities as a Christian gentleman. I worked with Dr. Bales for five years at Harding and I testify gladly to his capacity for friendships, his integrity as a man, and his deep devotion to what he conceives to be his duty. If I sometimes thought him sailing in wrong directions, I never once thought him rudderless.

Dr. Bales speaks quickly of his belief that *Voices* "advocates some old denominational errors." It remains a puzzle to me that he would speak of "denominational errors" as if he belonged himself to a non-denominational group. The word refers primarily to that which has been named. Since the Church of Christ has clearly given itself a name (printed on deeds and insurance policies, painted on churches, chiseled in limestone over college entranceways), it is a denominated thing—it is a denomination. To be quite honest with this word would be a first step toward correcting that religious arrogance which cripples so many of our people.

Since Dr. Bales did not mention it, I should remind readers that both the editor and the publisher of *Voices* have said they do not agree with every opinion expressed in it. I feel no need to defend every opinion in the book, although I plead vigorously the right of differing Christians to be heard in open forum. I am not so uncomfortable through my association with these writers as Dr. Bales would have to be, since I do not postulate a community that can only be saved in terms of a rigidly defined quantity of truth.

I am heartened by Dr. Bales' admission that diversity may arise because we are "at different stages of knowledge of God's will." Since he says that we may "fellowship other Christians without their having attained perfection," we seem closer together than my earlier remarks indicated. But long experience warns me to be cautious of how broadly I interpret these words. Magnanimous as they sound, I fear they do not really mean that we can fellowship premillenialists or folk who use pianos, not even while we are waiting for them to get as knowledgeable as we are.

I have been puzzled for years about how to account for the thousands of brilliant and devoted students of the Bible who consistently go astray in their reading (i.e., do not turn up with Church of Christ interpretations). When all these people reject us, are they merely hardheaded and ignorant, or do they honestly fail to see that we have the only possible set of interpretations? We have never adequately grappled with this question of why *we* were singled out to be Elect Interpreters while millions of others grope in darkness—yet grope eagerly and confirm the sincerity of their groping by the beauty and holiness of their lives.

A professor at Harding College once told me, rather lamely I thought, that the only explanation he had was that we were chosen, like the Jews of old, to be God's true interpreters. I loved the man, but I could not believe this.

I agree that accepting Jesus as Lord means trying to do His will, but I think men may honestly differ as to precisely what that will may be in some situations. As for whether Dr. Hardeman accepts Christ as Lord, I incline to think he does. There may be differences between his understanding and mine, but I think he is today giving his energy and talents to helping the poor and deprived of this earth because he was so instructed by Jesus. I could be wrong, but I am willing and eager to believe this.

Dr. Bales wonders how some of the writers accept Jesus as Lord "when they repudiate some things which are clearly taught in the Bible." Twenty-five years in the Church of Christ have taught me that the phrase "clearly taught", as we use it, means "those teachings of Christ which *we* accept."

For example, our people can repudiate foot washing (John 7:12-15), fasting (Matt. 6:16-18), advice on how to get well (James 5:14), and the holy kiss (Rom. 16:16, I Cor. 16:20, 2 Cor. 13:13, 1 Th. 5:26, 1 Pet. 5:14) and be readily accepted as folk who accept Jesus as Lord. Yet no statements in the Bible are any clearer than these. They simply happen to be imperatives which we cannot stress because they are not in our tradition. So we explain them away and even jest at those who practice them in humble, literal-minded faith. After these many years in the Church of Christ, I find it all boils down to this: if you accept what I accept, then you accept Jesus as Lord. If you understand differently from me, then you reject Him, and I reject you. It no longer makes much sense to me.

I emphatically deny that writers in *Voices* have "freed themselves from the authority of Christ and His word." Nothing could be further from the truth. The astonishing thing which Dr. Bales is really saying is that these writers now differ from mainline Church of Christ orthodoxy and therefore may be casually charged with having freed themselves from Christ's authority. Why do we persist in saying